

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 33-38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 were pending at the time the Office Action was mailed on October 27, 2008.

Claims 1-4, 8, 12, 13, 16-19, 23, 27, 28, and 33-36 are being amended. Claims 45-51 are new. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found, for example, in the specification, on page 7, lines 17-20, page 8, lines 11-13 and 17-19.

Reconsideration of the Action is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Action Responsive to Amendment filed July 23, 2008**

The Office stated that claims 16 and 28 should be changed since the specification allegedly failed to provide proper antecedent basis. Without conceding the Office's statement, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides proper antecedent basis for currently amended claims 16 and 28.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 33-38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2004/0006744 ("Jones") in view of U.S. 6,611,802 ("Lewis"). Specifically, the Office concedes that "Jones does not specifically teach 'selecting a suggestion template from among multiple suggestions templates'" (Page 6). However, the Office states that "Lewis selecting a suggestion template from among multiple suggestions templates." Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the current amendments.

Without conceding the Office's rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as currently amended, recites "modifying the XML electronic document structure in conformance with the rules of the XML document type definition or the XML schema." This feature is not taught by the combination of Jones and Lewis. In contrast, Jones discusses "validation of an extensible markup language (XML) document and reporting of schema violations in real time as a user edits the document" (Jones, paragraph [0005]). Lewis discusses proof reading and correcting dictated text (Lewis, Col. 2, lines 16-17). Specifically, Lewis discusses "reviewing

each the marked textual error [...]; accepting user specified changes to each marked textual error[...]" (Lewis, Abstract). In marked contrast to the feature recited in claim 1, neither Jones nor Lewis discusses modifying an XML electronic document structure in conformance with the rules of the XML document type definition or the XML schema.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as currently amended, is not made obvious by combining Jones with Lewis and is in condition for allowance. For at least the same reason, independent claims 13, 16, 28, and 33, dependent claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 34-38, 40, 41, 43 and 44, and new claims 45-51 are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Office, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, Applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that Applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Office with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : William Lin  
Serial No. : 10/665,156  
Filed : September 18, 2003  
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-0610001 / P563

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2009

/Xin Ma/

Xin Ma

Reg. No. 57,555

Customer No. 21876  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60538069.doc